

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

23rd Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXIII, No. 11

P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015

© June 15, 1993

A Shaky Foundation: It's a Difficult Time for NSF

The opening months of the Clinton Presidency have not been a happy time for the National Science Foundation, a pillar of basic research in an Administration that extols technology as an essential ingredient of economic prosperity. Search through the Administration's pronouncements and, indeed, some words of affection are to be found for fundamental research. But with rare exception, they are appended to adulations of industrial research, commercially aimed technology transfer from university and government labs, and bigger industrial roles for both.

With little new money at its disposal, the Clinton Administration is largely confined to shuffling existing accounts, mainly at the Pentagon, to new purposes. These shifts of defense funds, under the heading of R&D conversion, are difficult to track in the confusion that reigns between the White House and Congress, but the emphasis is overwhelmingly toward technology.

Clinton hasn't ignored the customary clamor of basic

passage of the President's budget would normally be Presidential pressure on key legislators. But, with Clinton's image and influence in tatters, there is no likelihood of a White House drive to wrest a few extra dollars for a government agency virtually unknown to the general public.

Second to Presidential intervention, personal politicking by the agency chief is the prescribed method for influencing budget matters. But NSF has been thin at the top from the opening day of the Clinton Administration.

That's about the time it became known that Director Walter Massey would soon depart for a Vice Presidency of the statewide University of California system. NSF has thus been unrepresented at the break-in rites, a crucial period in the evolution of a new Presidential Administration. While

(Continued on Page 3)

Stewart and NIH Survive Fast—P.5 A Boost for Behavioral Science—P.6

researchers who depend on NSF. But the amounts sought by the Administration do not signify a high priority for basic science. Clinton's doomed \$16 billion Economic Stimulus Package, which was intended to supplement funds in this year's budget, contained \$207 million for NSF. That's the amount that Congress cut from Bush's final budget for the Foundation. Pressed for time in preparing the budget for next year, Clinton and company thus picked up the numbers originally proposed by their predecessors. However, after a Republican filibuster blocked the overall Stimulus Package, NSF was not among the parts that Clinton tried to salvage. For the present fiscal year, NSF was thus left with \$2.7 billion, essentially a standstill budget.

For fiscal 1994 (starting October 1), Clinton asked Congress for \$3.1 billion for NSF, a respectable 16 percent increase over the 1993 appropriation. But the proposed 16-percent increase was pared to 11 percent last month by the House Subcommittee for NSF appropriations. With spending cuts now the rage on Capitol Hill, not even the reduced amount can be considered safe. Furthermore, following a pattern of recent years, the House Subcommittee reshuffled NSF's internal accounts, raising funds for education programs and trimming the amounts proposed for research.

In this circumstance, the most potent weapon for assuring

In Brief

From a sci-policy veteran at the White House: With Republicans victorious in the Senate election in Texas, there goes another reason for the Clinton Administration to muster a strenuous effort for the Superconducting Super Collider. As for the Space Station, it's noted that Presidential Science Advisor John Gibbons has never been keen for that one, while back in his Congressional days, Budget chief Leon Panetta railed against the Space Station as expensive and useless.

Deadline is July 16 for applications in the Department of Commerce's new Japanese Manufacturing Technology Fellowship Program, which offers 60 slots in Japanese industrial firms for American engineers. Appointments, for 15 months, include three months of language training in the US. For details: Japan Manufacturing Technology Fellowship Program, Room 4817, Dept. of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230; tel. 202/482-0356; fax 202/482-4826.

Competition among Washington-based disease lobbies long ago smashed the bounds of good taste, but even so: On the recent occasion of the 25th anniversary of the National Eye Institute, a combine of professional eye-care societies issued a luncheon invitation that asked: "Did you know that surveys demonstrate repeatedly that BLINDNESS, even more than memory loss, is the disability most feared by all Americans?"

A letter in the June 11 Wall Street Journal, on the issue of breast feeding versus formula, states that "the reputation of the Academy of Pediatrics has been tainted because of the formula company revenue they receive, all the while giving lip service to breast feeding."

In Quotes: NSF Stuck in a Pattern of Little Growth

The National Science Foundation's sluggish financial growth in recent years was concisely described May 20 at a Congressional hearing by Richard S. Nicholson, Executive Officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Nicholson, NSF Assistant Director for Mathematical and Physical Sciences from 1985-89, testified at the opening of a series of hearings by the Science Subcommittee of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee on renewal of NSF's basic legislative charter. The following excerpt is from his prepared statement.

Despite strong support from the Reagan and Bush Administrations and in the Congress, NSF's research budget has shown relatively little growth over the past several years. Citing the Foundation's potential contributions to the US economic competitiveness, and following the recommendations of the Packard-Bromley report [A *Renewed Partnership*, 1986, issued by the White House Science Council], President Reagan, in January 1987, proposed to double the NSF budget within five years. Consistent with the President's intent, his request for FY 1988 contained a 17 percent increase for NSF. Congressional action, however, yielded a substantially smaller increase that year, only about 5.5 percent, and most of that was targeted to education rather than research.

The story has been essentially the same in recent years. As a result, rather than doubling from FY 1987 to FY 1992, NSF's budget grew at about half that rate, and R&D funding in NSF rose by less than 40 percent. The problem is not that NSF has enemies. Few in Congress or the Administration oppose NSF or its programs. The problem is that NSF's supporters are not powerful enough to overcome the limitations that stem from its competing for the shrinking pool of money available for domestic discretionary programs.

Last year was a particularly difficult one for NSF. For FY 1993 [October 1, 1992-September 30, 1993], the Bush Administration requested an increase in the Foundation's budget of more than 18 percent. This was intended to put the agency "back on the doubling track." However, when all was said and done, once again the Foundation's request came up short and the agency ended up with a much smaller overall increase.

At first glance, the \$2.7 billion appropriated for FY 1993 looks like a respectable 6 percent gain over the previous year. But, in reality, most of the \$161 million increase

simply restored NSF funding of the US Antarctic research program, which in FY 1992 was financed largely by appropriations to other agencies. R&D funding at NSF went up by only \$37 million, to \$2 billion, which amounts to a loss of resources after adjusting for inflation. For the individual research directorates, this meant reductions of 15 to 20 percent from the request. [The NSF Directorate for] Education and Human Resources, on the other hand, received slightly more than requested, netting a 4.8 percent increase over FY 1992.

Apart from these budget actions, 1992 saw more turmoil for NSF. The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee responsible for NSF included language in its FY 1993 report forcefully directing the Foundation to expand its mission into areas with more explicit industrial-commercial payoffs.

The Administration and Congress engaged in a bruising fight over proposed rescissions of a number of specific NSF grants [mainly in the social sciences]. And then-Director Walter Massey created a Special Commission on the Future of NSF, which reported back (in a short document that has been subject to varying interpretations) that, while improving linkages to industry was all well and good, the Foundation should stick primarily to its traditional mission of supporting high-quality basic research.

President Clinton in his *Vision of Change for America* has maintained the tradition of promising to double NSF's budget. The President is requesting an increase of \$2.3 billion over the next four years to help revitalize US civilian technology development. His "stimulus package," defeated by a filibuster in the Senate, contained a supplemental appropriation of over \$200 million for NSF, intended to restore some of the cuts imposed by the FY 1993 appropriation. Clinton's FY 1994 proposal includes \$3.18 billion for NSF, an increase of \$447 million (16.3 percent) over the FY 1993 appropriated level. (The percentage increase, of course, would have been smaller, had the FY 1993 supplemental been approved.)

The Administration's support is, of course, good news for NSF, but the reality is that the Foundation faces tough competition and is certain to have difficulty in translating this support into actual appropriations.

© 1993, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher

Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher

Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager

Glen D. Grant

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, \$395.00 (two years, \$670.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

Math Soc. Aids Ex-USSR Colleagues

The American Mathematical Society reports that it has raised nearly \$100,000 from mathematicians around the world to aid members of the profession and math institutions in the former Soviet Union. In addition, the Sloan Foundation has provided a matching fund of \$100,000, which was followed by \$350,000 from the Soros Foundation. For details: Tim Goggins; tel. 401/455-4110; fax 331-3842.

... NSF Director on the Way Out at a Crucial Time

(Continued from Page 1)

the White House crew brought in by Clinton has been getting acquainted and forming alliances with each other and the managers of the Executive agencies, the Foundation has essentially been in a caretaker mode since Inauguration Day. Lame duck Massey, busy with his move to California, remained at NSF until April 5, when Deputy Director Frederick Bernthal, a 1990 Bush appointee and former physics professor with a Republican pedigree, became Acting Director. Bernthal is not considered a candidate for Director.

Low among Presidential priorities, the search for a successor for Massey produced a short list and a no-thanks last month from one prospect, Sandra Faber, a UC Santa Cruz astronomy professor. Since then, the NSF grapevine has carried reports of an imminent announcement of a selection for Director. But, as of June 14, the White House had not made the customary declaration of an intention to nominate, nor has the rumor mill provided anything substantial. If the present pattern of passage to office continues, several months will elapse between the nomination and the installation of the next NSF Director.

Meanwhile, the sense of political vulnerability that infects the Foundation may be inferred from a semi-opaque statement, "In Support of Basic Research," made public on June 2 by the National Science Board. An unwieldy body of 24 Presidential appointees, drawn mainly from academic administration and industrial executive suites, the NSB is regularly referred to as "the policymaking arm" of NSF. For legalistic purposes of approving all but the smaller awards and programs of NSF, it no doubt is. But in terms of the actual operations of the Foundation, if the Board forgot to show up for its monthly or so meetings, nothing much would be different.

The real role of the Board is to nourish and hand down the founding purpose of NSF, support of basic research in universities, which it does with occasional statements to the world at large. In recent years, under Congressional prodding and budget dictates, science education, mainly at the pre-college levels, has been elevated in the Foundation's priorities, receiving nearly \$500 million of this year's total of \$2.7 billion. But basic research is built into the genes of the NSF establishment; education is an add-on, and given its favored place in Congressional priorities, is doubly regarded by Foundation oldtimers as a drain on basic research.

The Science Board's report "In Support of Basic Research" is a shield against pressures for NSF to join the technology parade. The report actually traces back to the final months of the Bush Administration, which foreshadowed Clinton's devotion to technology by tinkering with programs for industrial R&D. At the same time, NSF's Congressional overseers were directing the Foundation to pitch more money to technology and the support of academic-industrial collaboration. With education safely locked

into Congressional sentiments, diverse forces for change at NSF were thus impinging on its sacred mission, basic research.

Responding to these pressures to do something useful for the economy, and sensing an opportunity to put his own stamp on the Foundation, Director Walter Massey asked the National Science Board to convene a Special Commission on the Future of NSF. "The starting point for anything we do," Massey declared at the outset, "must be strengthening the research and education enterprise. But we also have to do more to bring the different actors—the public and private sectors, academia and industry—closer together."

With 15 members cut from the same professional cloth as the Science Board, the Commission got under way on September 15, during the opening days of the Presidential election campaign, and fulfilled its mandate to report in late November—after the election, before the inauguration. The intention, it may be inferred, was to be ready for the next Administration, regardless of the winner.

Co-chaired by William Danforth, Chancellor of Washington University, and Robert Galvin, Chairman of the Executive Committee and former CEO of Motorola, the Commission seemed to reaffirm NSF's traditional role: "Redirecting NSF's activities from research and education," its report stated, "would have little or no effect on the US competitive position in the near term, but would severely restrict prospects for the long term."

But then it seemed to contradict itself: "The history of science and its uses," the report stated, "suggests that the NSF should have two goals in the allocation of its resources. One is to support first-rate research at many points on the frontiers of knowledge, identified and defined by the best researchers. The second goal is a balanced allocation of resources in strategic research areas in response to scientific opportunities to meet national goals."

Next, the Commission seemed to go beyond its mandate by suggesting, though in vaporous terms, a major science-policymaking role for the National Science Board. Calling for development of "a broad national policy going beyond science and engineering and including technology and its applications," the Commission added: "The NSB, in helping to develop a national science and engineering policy, should move quickly to propose a role for the NSF based on its past mission and a vision of what is needed today."

Even allowing for the vagueness of the prose, that's an assignment that the Board has traditionally shunned, though it was actually included in NSF's founding statute. Starting long ago, the elders of the Foundation feared that involvement in big policy issues might bring the fledgling NSF into collisions with the big powers in R&D, mainly defense and nuclear power. So, they declined the role, and ever since, the NSF Board has confined itself to NSF affairs.

Submitted to the Board on November 20, the Commis-

(Continued on Page 4)

... NSF Board Reaffirms Basic Research Priority

(Continued from Page 3)

sion's work, covering a bit over 10 pages, elicited an enthusiastic statement from NSF Director Massey: The report, he said, "confirms my original view that the environment for science and engineering is changing in many ways." He praised the report for its "recognition of the need for greater linkages and integration in all facets of what NSF does"—including, in Massey's words, "more use of partnerships, especially with industry and other government agencies in strategic research areas...."

The clarity eluded others, however, leading many to share the view expressed by Richard Nicholson, Executive Officer of the American Association for Advancement of Science, who characterized the report of the Special Commission on the Future of NSF as "a short document that has been subject to varying interpretations" [see P. 2].

In any case, the next step called for the Science Board to grade the report of the Commission it had appointed. The result was "In Support of Basic Research," an even shorter report [2 pages] that waffles about but eventually emerges in support of basic research as NSF's real and central business.

After opening with a paean to basic research as the intellectual underpinning of the modern world, the Board stated: "This report responds to the specific Commission recommendations that the Board reaffirm the role of the National Science Foundation in the support of the US research system, and that the Board exercise leadership over a broad range of science and technology policy issues."

Inexplicably, no further word appears about the Board and policy leadership. But in support of NSF's traditional role as a bankroll for basic research, the sentiment is clear.

The report notes the Commission's assertion that "the NSF should have two goals in the allocation of its

resources"—support of basic research and so-called strategic research. Addressing this suggestion, the Board stated: "Basic research is the foundation and the essence of both, assuring a deep reservoir of knowledge and providing choices and flexibility for addressing future needs."

While acknowledging that the benefits of basic research "will be achieved only in connection with other parts of the nation's scientific and technological enterprise, including applied research, education, technology transfer and development, innovation, and manufacturing," the Board declared:

"Basic research is not intended—nor should it be expected—to advance short-term goals. Rather, it is an investment that, like education, takes time to mature but has tremendous practical payoffs."

The National Science Board has thus performed its duty of holding up the banner of basic research and advising politics to moderate its expectations of quick payoffs from scientific expenditures. That's about all that can be expected from this obscure body of part-time policymakers. The rest is up to politics, which, apart from pumping money into science education, used to refrain from setting major priorities for NSF. In recent years, however, impatient legislators have prodded NSF to do its bit for the economy.

The outcome rests with politics. But given the prostrate condition of the White House, the anti-spending fervor on Capitol Hill, and the absence of strong scientific leadership, NSF is not likely to emerge soon from the fiscal doldrums.—DSG

Job Changes & Appointments

Murray Goldstein, Director of the NIH National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke for the past 11 years, has announced that he'll step down, probably in August, and will become Medical and Scientific Director of the United Cerebral Palsy Research and Education Foundation, which is based in Washington. Also at NIH: **Richard J. Hodes**, an immunologist at the National Cancer Institute, has been named Director of the National Institute on Aging. His appointment, effective immediately, was made by NIH Director **Bernadine Healy**, who announced plans to leave by June 30 after the Clinton Administration decided to appoint a new head for NIH, as yet unrevealed.

Allan Kornberg, a political scientist at Duke University, has been named Director of the Division of Social, Behavioral and Economic Research at the National Science Foundation.

Arati Prabhakar, formerly of the Defense Research Projects Agency, has been confirmed as Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology. She is the first woman to head NIST, a key agency in Clinton's technology policy. **John Lyons**, the previous chief of NIST, is serving as Science Advisor to the Director.

Rethinking Funding for R&D

With science funding, at best, level and maybe in decline, this is the season for novel ideas to restore fiscal zip to research. Senators Tom Harkin (D-Iowa) and Mark Hatfield (R-Oregon) recently proposed a kind of tax on health insurance to supplement Congressional appropriations for the National Institutes of Health.

Tying their plan to Clinton's proposal for universal health insurance, the Senators called for earmarking \$5 a month in each health insurance policy. With an estimated 100 million policies foreseen under a national plan, that would provide an additional \$6 billion a year for NIH. So far there's been little reaction to the proposal.

Meanwhile, the National Academy of Sciences plans to unveil a new formula for science funding on June 21, with the release of a report prepared by a committee chaired by Phillip A. Griffiths, Director of the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, *Science, Technology, and the Federal Government: National Goals for a New Era*.

Stewart Ends Fast with NIH Battered But Unyielding

In the manner of elephantine organizations, the National Institutes of Health stolidly absorbed prime-time opprobrium last week as its leading inhouse tormentor, Walter Stewart, flirted with martyrdom via self-induced starvation.

Then, upon doctors' advice, sweetened by several supportive Congressional inquiries to higher authority, Stewart, age 48, wound up his hunger strike on June 11, the 33rd day, he said, on a diet of water spiked with sodium and potassium. His weight was reported down 30 pounds and his blood pressure had dropped 40 points, raising alarm among family, friends, and doctors. Though Stewart's ordeal was over, some two dozen admirers, including "whistle-blowers" whom he had assisted, pledged they would endure one-day fasts apiece in support of his cause.

Stewart and his long-time partner at NIH, Ned Feder, 65, came out of the 33-day episode far ahead on public-relations points. But, in fact, their status remained the same as it was on day one of the hunger strike: they're still under orders to terminate scientific misconduct studies on government time, and report for conventional duties at NIH.

The precipitating grievance for these bizarre events was a sudden job reassignment for the pair, revealed to them in April. On paper, the two constituted the Biophysical Histology Section of the Laboratory of Analytical Chemistry in the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases. But, having long ago disposed of the snails whose nervous systems once occupied their professional hours, Stewart and Feder devoted themselves full time for many years to investigating scientific delinquency. Their chiefs were peeved, but NIH is an easygoing, tolerant place, and their performance was regularly rated "excellent"—a documentary reality that Stewart and Feder now trumpet as evidence of persecution.

With their files sealed up by NIH cops on May 10, the pair protested that a bunch of partially completed misconduct investigations would be stalled and that trusting whistle-blowers would be endangered. Stewart's fast commenced that day, with the pair issuing a statement in which they said they "respectfully but firmly request" reunification with their files. They also requested a pledge that, in effect, called for officialdom to renounce an alleged indifference to scientific crime, and to give Stewart and Feder a "public hearing on the true reasons" their operations were shut down.

NIH contended they were reassigned because they had strayed far afield from science, into a plagiarism controversy concerning a biography of Abraham Lincoln. Stewart, Feder, and friends strongly suggested that they had triggered retaliation by revealing a tacky state of integrity in scientific research. The Lincolniana foray, Stewart said, was for the purpose of calibrating their computerized "plagiarism machine," a scanner-fed rig for comparing texts.

While NIH bumbled about inconclusively, Stewart lost weight and gained stature. Dramatic and without precedent,

the spectacle of an NIH scientist voluntarily perishing on principle naturally caught the attention of the news media, with which Stewart and Feder have carefully cultivated mutually beneficial relations. No amount of money could buy such a bum press for the great NIH, whose soon-to-depart Director, Bernadine Healy, said Stewart's fast was none of her business. Maybe so, but the price was high in the good public image that NIH covets.

During his fast, a progressively emaciated Stewart appeared on an assortment of local and national TV news shows, berating NIH as negligent about scientific crime and indifferent to the plight of whistle-blowers they had befriended.

The New York Times, while rejecting the appropriateness of a hunger strike for Stewart's grievance, editorially suggested on June 4 that he and Feder were the victims of vengeance for "doing the investigative job that the NIH and other scientific institutions have botched miserably for many years." Stewart's fast and complaints against NIH were reported in detail in the *Times*, the *Washington Post*, and other major papers.

Several members of Congress chipped in with letters asking the Department of Health and Human Services to explain the peculiar events at NIH. Such inquiries are routine, and not difficult to elicit. Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-Md.), for example, wrote to HHS Secretary Donna Shalala on May 26, telling Shalala that Stewart's wife has "informed me that her husband had begun a hunger strike" in protest against his reassignment from misconduct investigations to a laboratory job. "I would appreciate knowing of your plans for ensuring the continuance of research in the area of scientific misconduct, and the basis for the personnel actions taken against Mr. Stewart," Mikulski wrote.

Senator David Pryor (D-Ark.), Chairman of the Governmental Operations Subcommittee on the Civil Service, sent his letter, dated June 11, to the HHS General Counsel, Harriet Raab, who was assigned by Shalala to look into the case. Coaching from certain quarters may be inferred from Pryor's letter, which noted that the Stewart-Feder work "has consistently been rated 'Excellent' by their reviewing supervisors." The Senator's letter asked: "Has the research of Mr. Stewart and Dr. Feder contributed to the understanding of the conduct of science and scientific misconduct?" Pryor then observed, "I have also been told that a conference on plagiarism will be hosted by NIH in two weeks and that the conference will in part be based on the work of Mr. Stewart and Dr. Feder."

Rep. John Dingell, the thunderous Michigan Democrat who was drawn into the scientific misconduct issue by Stewart and Feder in 1989, has kept a wary distance from the fasting Stewart, at the suggestion of image-conscious staff counselors. When Stewart and Feder sought his influential help, Dingell responded that the fast smacked of blackmail

(Continued on Page 6)

... Private Philanthropy Should Stake Stewart-Feder

(Continued from Page 5)

and "blocks progress on resolving the issue how the Federal Government can best protect the public from scientific misconduct."

What of the future of Stewart and Feder, who, it may be safely assumed, are not likely to thrive at NIH? Though prickly, obnoxious to many, and widely disliked for their loner roles in the midst of the great American science machine, the fact is that they have performed extraordinarily valuable services. They forced scientific misconduct onto the agenda of the American scientific community when establishment blowhards were proclaiming that the incidence of misdeeds is too minuscule to warrant concern. The so-called Baltimore case and others would have disappeared into the files if Stewart and Feder hadn't mustered evidence that even NIH's droopy investigative apparatus had to recognize as compelling.

It's because of them that many professional societies and universities have issued codes of proper scientific conduct. Academe's thriving conference circuit on misconduct did not exist before Stewart and Feder raised embarrassing issues that could not be ignored.

While the old Office of Scientific Integrity bumbled about at NIH, Stewart and Feder befriended many in that vulnerable class of nonconformists known as whistle-blowers and escorted their grievances through a system that was often uninterested or hostile.

Clearly, they deserve to continue in their odd role of self-appointed ombudsmen for scientists who encounter wrongdoing. Federal officials counter that maybe that was so at one time, but now, they insist, scientific virtue is competently policed by the recently established Office of Research Integrity in the Department of Health and Human Resources. ORI does seem to function better than its defunct predecessor. But that doesn't rule out the value of independent investigators poking around the dark recesses of scientific conduct.

Government support for such oddballs as Stewart and Feder would have to contend with restraints and sniping, and would go aground sooner or later on some contentious issue. For continuing their work, the two would be far better off with a modest helping of private philanthropic support—say, about \$300,000 a year for salary and operations for five years, which would suffice to demonstrate whether they merit continued support.

The impediment, of course, is the prevalence of mouse-like valor at the money mounds that could painlessly issue a check for that amount. The philanthropy set could thus have the novel experience of doing something different and valuable, even if a bit naughty in terms of their customary portfolios of safe and uncontroversial awards. SGR is thinking, for example, of the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, the Ford Foundation, or the far smaller, but still affluent, Carnegie Corporation. Perhaps the three could share the

burden.

Finally, note must be taken of the role of Bernadine Healy, scheduled to leave the Directorship of NIH by June 30, after which, she says, she'll explore a run for the 1994 Republican nomination for the Senate in Ohio. What was Healy's response to Stewart's reassignment, fast, and the ensuing noxious publicity for NIH? SGR inquired on June 8 of Johanna Schneider, the Director's Senior Advisor for Media Relations. Schneider replied that the decision to reassign the pair "was made at the Institute level." Healy, she emphasized, "did not take part in the decision."

Two weeks earlier, in an interview with SGR [June 1 issue] Healy, in response to a question about her tumultuous reign, said: "I believe that being NIH Director is being the NIH *Director*. That it is a leadership position, which you have an obligation to participate in actively, engaging the enterprise, engaging the office, making decisions, putting your fingerprints on those decisions, whether that makes you vulnerable or not."—DSG

NIH Reauthorization Bill Boosts Behavioral Sciences and Nursing

Stalled by abortion-related controversies during much of the Bush Administration, a reauthorization bill for the National Institutes of Health made it through Congress last month with a number of new measures that drew little attention off Capitol Hill. [The text of the bill, S1, the NIH Revitalization Act of 1993, is in the *Congressional Record* of May 20, starting on page H.2620].

The bill directs NIH to establish an Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research, and to tell Congress by next February just how much NIH is spending on these disciplines. Not to be included, S1 states, are "neurobiological research, or research in which the behavior of an organism is observed for the purpose of determining activity at the cellular or molecular level."

Another provision gives statutory underpinning to NIH's recent cautious flirtations with "alternative medicine" by establishing a full-fledged office bearing that title.

The Center for Nursing Research, reluctantly established by NIH in 1985 to fend off pressures for the more illustrious, and costly, institute status, has made the grade, with a promotion in S1 to National Institute of Nursing Research.

Applying the customary Congressional process of nudging NIH in directions demanded by disease lobbies, the bill calls for annual reports to Congress on what Bethesda is doing about chronic fatigue syndrome. There's also a directive for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to review research and report on whether a relationship exists between the consumption of legal and illegal drugs.

Widely publicized in the bill's odyssey were measures for tighter and more centralized administration of AIDS research—resisted by NIH but insisted upon by Congress.

More IN PRINT: Education, Environment, GAO List

(Continued from Page 8)

The Federal Role in Improving Elementary and Secondary Education (76 pp., no charge), from the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), Capitol Hill's counterpart of the White House Office of Management and Budget, an examination of policy options in anticipation of the expiration this year of major federal legislation for pre-college education. With federal funds accounting for only six percent of elementary- and secondary-school expenditures, the CBO notes, nearly three-quarters of that contribution is devoted to creating "equal educational opportunity," with the balance focused on educational research and other efforts to improve instruction. The basic issue facing Congress in renewing the legislation, says the CBO, is "equity versus excellence." In even-handed fashion, the report discusses national educational goals and assessment methods, block grants, vouchers, incentives for innovations, etc. The report was prepared by Jay Noell of CBO's Human Resources and Community Development Division under the direction of Nancy Gordon and Bruce Vavrichuk.

Order from: Congressional Budget Office, Publications Office, Second and D Sts. SW, Washington, DC 20515; tel. 202/226-2809; fax 202/226-2714.

Educational Testing: The Canadian Experience With Standards, Examinations, and Assessments (GAO/PEMD-93-11; 74 pp., no charge), from the General Accounting Office (GAO), a study requested by members of the House Committee on Education and Labor in response to proposals for US adoption of a national system of educational-achievement testing. The GAO points out that educational standards are set at the provincial level in Canada, with heavy involvement of teachers, and that the five provinces with examination systems "have placed a priority on the content validity of the exams at the expense of comparability of exam scores." The report states that "the evidence is mixed as to whether these tests really have teeth or not," adding that high-stakes exams "may be less necessary when the importance of learning the set curriculum is emphasized in many other ways."

Also from the GAO: **Energy and Science Reports and Testimony: 1992** (GAO/RCED-93-131; 53 pp., no charge), lists scores of GAO reports, statements, etc. presented to Congress last year. Topics include SEMATECH, royalty sharing at government labs, indirect costs, S&T manpower, small-business research programs, nuclear safety, energy conservation, foreign aid for the Super Collider, etc. Instructions are given for ordering copies, all free.

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

Semiannual Report to the Congress: Number 8 (58 pp., no charge), by the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) of the National Science Foundation, covering last October 1 through March 31, chronicles a flock of nickel-and-dime

offenses by the Foundation's clients and employees, but no blockbuster crimes. The record thus suggests that the NSF crowd is either a model of rectitude or that its miscreants are especially clever. Among the inhouse misdeeds reported was "abuse" of parking rights under NSF's car-pool system, in which NSF pays half the parking fees for 162 enrolled cars, at an annual cost of \$150,000. Following a series of allegations, the OIG reports, it reviewed 70 of the car-pool applications and found that "12 contained material false statements demonstrating intentional or reckless disregard for the truth, and 21 contained minor misrepresentations." As a result, the report continues, "NSF management recommended administrative actions against 43 employees." The report does not tell what happened next.

Order from: National Science Foundation, Office of the Inspector General, Publications, Room 1241, 1800 G St. NW, Washington, DC 20550; tel. 202/357-9457; fax 202/357-7401.

1993 Briefing Book on Environmental and Energy Legislation (205 pp., \$65), from the nearly 400-member Congressional Environmental and Energy Study Conference, the largest of many non-partisan research organizations formed by members of Congress to focus on specific issues. The *Briefing Book* contains analytical papers and reports prepared for the members, summaries of major environmental statutes, reviews of recent legislative decisions, Congressional committee rosters, a description of budget procedures, etc.

Order from: Environmental and Energy Study Institute, Suite 700, 122 C St. NW, Washington, DC 20001-2109; tel. 202/628-1400; fax 202/628-1825.

To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station, Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Enter my subscription

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$395.00 ☐
two years, \$670.00 ☐

Non-USA airmail, \$35.00 per year; non-USA surface mail
\$15.00 per year additional

☐ Check enclosed ☐ Please Bill

Please charge to ☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account# _____ Exp. date _____

Signature _____

Name _____

Address _____

Zip _____

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054 / FAX: (202) 362-2790

IN PRINT: Defense Conversion, Conflict of Interest

The publications listed are obtainable as indicated—from SGR.

Defense Conversion: Redirecting R&D (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01324-1; 239 pp., \$13), from the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), a mildly optimistic assessment of post-Cold War survival opportunities for the federal government's big labs, particularly the Department of Energy's high-cost trio, Los Alamos, Livermore, and Sandia. OTA observes they're well equipped and staffed for non-military work and that "industry interest in cooperative cost-shared R&D projects is now at an all-time high." But, noting the difficulties that often snarl collaborative efforts, OTA wonders whether effective relations can be established "before the new enthusiasm cools."

OTA also expresses doubt that industrial partnerships can suffice to keep the labs viable, and strongly raises the possibility of big civilian missions—such as low-polluting transportation systems—as a successor to their shrunken military roles. The report also discusses conversion of Pentagon R&D programs, including those sponsored by the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA)—formerly DARPA and still at the Pentagon, but recast by the Clinton Administration as a "dual-use" agency. An appendix to the report provides a brief, admiring description of government-industry R&D collaboration in Germany.

Also available, a previous OTA report on conversion: **After the Cold War: Living With Lower Defense Spending** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01274-0; 237 pp., \$12).

Order from: New Orders, Superintendent of Documents, PO Box 371954, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15250-7954; tel. 202/783-3238; fax 202/512-2250. Add 25 percent for international orders.

Framework Document on Managing Financial Conflicts of Interest (32 pp., no charge), from the Association of American Universities (AAU), a consortium of 56 universities that serves as the voice of big academe in Washington, a general discussion of financial conflict-of-interest guidelines for university employees, particularly in research areas. The issue is timely, says the report, because "The 1990s bring a renewed emphasis on technology transfer and economic competitiveness has emerged as a national priority."

The "framework," developed by AAU staff in consultation with the AAU Executive Committee, says each school should develop its own rules, but cites "certain key elements that should be included"—"definitions, disclosure, review processes, recommendations and decisions, opportunity for appeal, and utilization of appropriate university procedure for non-compliance with the policy." Included is a three-page list of reports, articles, etc., on conflict of interest, plus financial disclosure forms of several universities.

Order from: Association of American Universities, One Dupont Circle, Suite 730, Washington, DC 20036; attn. Lauren Wilson; tel. 202/466-5030; fax 202/296-4438.

Viewing Science and Technology Through a Multicultural Prism (47 pp., no charge), from the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), report on a program to encourage minority participation in research on values and ethical issues in science and technology. The report says the project was inspired by concern about sparse minority involvement in the Ethics and Values Studies Program sponsored by the National Science Foundation. Supported by NSF and several other organizations, the AAAS conducted a six-day workshop with researchers from minority groups in the summer of 1991. The report was prepared by Mark S. Frankel, Project Director and head of the AAAS Scientific Freedom, Responsibility and Law Program. Among various follow-up activities, the AAAS has established an Electronic Network for Minority Perspectives on Values and Ethical Issues in Science and Technology, available on a listserv account through INTERNET or BITNET. To subscribe to the listserv, send a one-line message that reads: SUBSCRIBE AAASMSP firstname lastname to LISTSERV@GWUVM.GWO.EDU.

Order the report from: American Association for the Advancement of Science, Directorate for Science and Policy Programs, 1333 H St. NW, Washington, DC 20005; tel. 202/326-6600; fax 202/289-4950.

Roadmap for Results: Trade Policy, Technology and American Competitiveness (62 pp., plus \$1 for shipping in US, \$3.50 overseas), from the Council on Competitiveness, Washington-based consortium of high-industry, big academe, and a few others, a novel addition to the overflowing shelves on what ails American industry: eight case studies of major trade disputes in recent years involving American industries and foreign competitors. The cast: flat panel displays, semiconductors, cellular mobile phones, the Uruguay Round R&D subsidies, US and European Community commercial aircraft, US-Japan supercomputer procurement agreements, Semi-Gas Systems and the US Committee on Foreign Investment in the US, and HDTV.

Analyzing the US response in these cases, the Council concluded, "Instead of developing a systematic approach—incorporating investment, technology, capital market, and education policies—to address our sectoral competitiveness problems, we have excessively burdened trade policy with the responsibility for solving them." SEMATECH, the government-subsidized industrial consortium for research on semiconductor manufacturing, represented a constructive approach to foreign competition, the Council states, whereas the sole reliance on anti-dumping restrictions failed to improve the performance of American flat-panel display manufacturers.

Order from: Council on Competitiveness, 900 17th St. NW, Suite 1050, Washington, DC 20006; tel. 202/785-3990; fax 202/785-3998.

(Continued on Page 7)

